DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 661 SP 036 987

TITLE Companion Document: Cross-Cutting Guidance for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
INSTITUTION Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 96
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Access to Education; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; *Government School Relationship; *Partnerships in Education; School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act

ABSTRACT

Among the most important funding resources for states and localities are the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Amendments to the ESEA enacted in 1994 make it easier for states and school districts to use ESEA resources to augment, expand, and support state and local reforms that will help move every child toward high standards and move the nation toward realizing the eight National Education Goals. This "companion document" to the ESEA discusses how states, school districts, and schools can link ESEA programs with each other, with Goals 2000, and with state and local programs to support coherent school reform efforts that raise achievement of all students. The document is organized around five major themes that guide ESEA programs: (1) high standards for all children, with the elements of education aligned; (2) a focus on teaching and learning; (3) partnerships among families, communities, and schools that support student achievement to high standards; (4) flexibility to stimulate local school-based and district initiatives, coupled with responsibility for student performance; and (5) resources targeted to areas of greatest needs, in amounts sufficient to make a difference. Part 1 of the document gives the background and brief history of ESEA, outlines the respective roles of ESEA and Goals 2000 in education reform, and describes how states, districts, and schools can plan for change. A table summarizes all of the programs authorized by the ESEA. Part 2 explains each of the law's five guiding themes in more detail and describes key ESEA program and statutory provisions that advance each theme. Examples illustrate how state and local programs put ESEA funds to use. Appendices contain a list of regional assistance centers, a list of guidance documents issued by the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Education Goals. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 408 643

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COMPANION DOCUMENT

Cross-cutting Guidance

FOR
THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION ACT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SEPTEMBER 1996

EA 028 285

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPANION DOCUMENT: CROSS-CUTTING GUIDANCE FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

U.S. Department of Education

September, 1996

Prepared by the U.S. Department of Education with editorial assistance from Nancy Kober, consultant and printing assistance from RMC Research Corporation.

Contents

Introduction 1

Purposes of the Companion Document 1

I. Using Federal Resources to Support Reform 4

Background and Brief History of the ESEA 4

Federal Legislation to Support State and Local Reform 5

Planning for Change 5

- *Establishing a vision* 6
- *Planning and integrating education programs in support of this vision* 6
- *Sustaining ongoing improvement* 8

Table: Overview of Key ESEA Programs 12

II. Improving Teaching and Learning with ESEA Resources 16

Theme 1. High standards for all children--with the elements of education aligned, so that everything is working together to help all students reach those standards 16

- *High standards that apply to* all *students* 16
- *Alignment of all educational components* 18

Theme 2. A focus on teaching and learning 19

- *Professional development* 20
- *Curricula and instruction* 22
- *Technical assistance and support* 28

THEME 3. PARTNERSHIPS AMONG FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, AND SCHOOLS THAT SUPPORT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS 31

- *Parental involvement* 31
- *Early childhood education and preschool-to-school transition* 36
- *Secondary school and school-to-work transitions* 37
- *Linking schools and communities* 39

THEME 4. FLEXIBILITY TO STIMULATE LOCAL SCHOOL-BASED AND DISTRICT INITIATIVE, COUPLED WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT PERFORMANCE 40

- *Areas of flexibility* 41
- *Accountability for results* 46

THEME 5. RESOURCES TARGETED TO AREAS WITH GREATEST NEEDS, IN AMOUNTS SUFFICIENT TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE 47

- *Targeting resources* 47
- *Participation of private school children* 48
- *Promoting equity* 49

CONCLUSION 50

GENERAL INFORMATION BOXES

Guiding Themes of the ESEA 2

A Sample Content Standard in English/Language Arts 18

ESEA Programs That Can Support Professional Development Activities 20

How Title I and Title VII Can Work Together to Help Schools, Districts, and States Raise the Performance of LEP Students 26

How Parents Can Support Children in School 36

New Waiver Opportunities in Federal Education Programs 42

BOXED EXAMPLES OF STATE AND LOCAL REFORMS SUPPORTED WITH FEDERAL RESOURCES

Hattiesburg, MS: One Plan, Not Eight Plans 8

Shelby County, KY: Deciding What Students Need and Making It Happen 10

Walsh and Pembina Counties, ND: A True Community Vision 11

Baltimore County, MD: Aligning Professional Development with High Standards 19

New Castle, DE: Bringing Coherence to Professional Development 22

Boston, MA: Leveraging Funds for Schoolwide Improvement 24

Union City, NJ: Technology As Resource for Instructional Reform 25

Lamar, CO: Raising Achievement of LEP Children through a Schoolwide Program . . 28

Texas Education Agency: School Support Teams as Change Agents 29

North Dakota: An Integrated Program Review 30

Miami Beach, FL: Parent Power Turning Around a School 32

Alamo Navajo Reservation, NM: Parents as Educational Partners 33

Canton, OH: Coordinating Family Literacy 35

Carpentersville, IL: Continuity from Preschool to School 37

Waipahu, HI: Reshaping a School with Workforce Learning 38

San Diego, CA: A Title I Secondary Schoolwide Program 39

Kentucky Department of Education: Safe and Drug-Free Schools As a Component of Comprehensive Reform 40

Oregon Department of Education: Coordinating Program Administration 44

Los Angeles, CA: A Charter for Change 46

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers 51

Appendix B: Guidance Documents Issued by the U.S. Department of Education for ESEA, Goals 2000, and Related Programs 55

Appendix C: National Education Goals 57

INTRODUCTION

The challenge is on for States, schools, and communities to transform teaching and learning in America. The kinds of schools that were merely dreamed of in the recent past are in clear view for the future and are already being realized in many communities across the nation.

Many States, districts, and schools are making interrelated changes in key elements of their educational systems to improve learning experiences for all children. They are setting higher content and performance standards for what all students should know and be able to do. They are revising curricula, renewing opportunities for teacher professional growth, implementing better teaching techniques, integrating technology into their classrooms, and designing innovative assessment strategies.

The U.S. Department of Education is committed to providing information, tools, and resources to help States and localities meet the challenges of reform. Among the most important funding resources are the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Amendments to the ESEA enacted in 1994 make it easier for States and school districts to use ESEA resources to augment, expand, and support State and local reforms that will help move every child toward high standards and move the nation toward realizing the eight National Education Goals. *(See Appendix C--National Education Goals.)*

As amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA), the ESEA for the first time stresses the need for *all* students--especially children at risk of school failure, the primary target group for federal aid--to develop the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind once expected of only the top students. The redesigned ESEA encourages States and school districts to connect federal programs with State and local reforms affecting all children, while retaining the focus on educational equity for the neediest children. In exchange for emphasizing higher student learning outcomes, federal legislation gives States and localities more flexibility to design and operate federal programs. The revamped ESEA is intended to work in concert with another important 1994 law, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. This Act supports State and local efforts to set challenging content and performance standards and to carry out reforms that will help all children meet these standards.

PURPOSES OF THE COMPANION DOCUMENT

This "companion document" to the ESEA discusses how States, school districts, and schools can link ESEA programs with each other, with Goals 2000, and with State and local programs to support coherent school reform efforts that raise achievement of all students. The document is organized around five major themes that guide ESEA programs.

GUIDING THEMES OF THE ESEA

1. High standards for all children--with the elements of education aligned, so that everything is working together to help all students reach those standards.

2. A focus on teaching and learning.

3. Partnerships among families, communities, and schools that support student achievement to high standards.

4. Flexibility to stimulate local school-based and district initiative, coupled with responsibility for student performance.

5. Resources targeted to areas of greatest needs, in amounts sufficient to make a difference.

The companion document also seeks to encourage coordinated State and local planning that first identifies the learning needs of children, next determines actions and strategies for meeting those needs, and finally pulls in resources--both dollars and people--from federal, State, and local programs to make these actions happen. The document further invites educators to view federal programs less as separate entities and more as components that can be integrated as necessary to improve teaching and learning.

Part I of this document gives the background and brief history of ESEA, outlines the respective roles of ESEA and Goals 2000 in education reform, and describes how States, districts, and schools can plan for change. At the end of Part I is a table summarizing all of the programs authorized by the ESEA. Part II--the core of the document--explains each of the law's five guiding themes in more detail and describes key ESEA programs and statutory provisions that advance each theme. Scattered throughout the document are examples in boxes that illustrate how State and local people are actually using ESEA funds, in conjunction with other resources, to support education reform.

The guidance in this document does not impose any requirements beyond those in the ESEA and other applicable federal statutes and regulations. Nor is this companion document meant to replace the program-specific guidance already disseminated by the U.S. Department of Education on ESEA Title I, Parts A-C; ESEA Titles II, IV, VI, and XI; Goals 2000; and related programs and topics. *(See Appendix B--Guidance Documents Issued by the U.S.*

Department of Education for ESEA, Goals 2000, and Related Programs.) Rather, this document is intended to complement those separate pieces of guidance. Both kinds of documents are important sources of information for educators implementing one or more ESEA programs.

I. Using Federal Resources to Support Reform

Background and Brief History of the ESEA

Established in 1965 as part of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty, the ESEA for 30 years has provided federal assistance to schools, communities, and children in need. With current funding of about $9.5 billion annually, the ESEA continues to be the single largest source of federal aid to K-12 schools. Title I, aimed at improving education for disadvantaged children in poor areas, remains the cornerstone of the Act.

Over the years, Congress has amended, expanded, streamlined, and revised the ESEA eight times, creating programs to help migrant children, neglected and delinquent youngsters, limited-English-proficient (LEP) students, and other special children. Other programs have been added to the Act to stimulate school improvements benefitting all students. Programs have been launched to enhance math and science instruction and to rid schools of drugs and violence. Smaller ESEA programs have been created to advance school desegregation, stimulate educational innovation, and achieve other special purposes.

Thirty years of sustained federal commitment under the ESEA has changed the face of American education in many ways. Title I has helped raise the academic achievement of millions of disadvantaged children, particularly in basic skills. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools program has increased public awareness about the role of schools in curbing violence and combatting illegal drug use; most schools now have curricula and policies to prevent violence and drug abuse. The Title II Eisenhower Professional Development program has familiarized thousands of classroom teachers with new knowledge and instructional techniques in mathematics, science, and other critical subjects. Title VII Bilingual Education has helped generations of children with limited English proficiency learn English and succeed in school. Other ESEA programs have yielded a host of benefits for students, teachers, and parents that would have been difficult to realize without federal support.

Consistent with their categorical nature and equity focus, ESEA programs have concentrated mainly on assisting specific groups of children and accomplishing special objectives, rather than on addressing the general education program in local schools. At times, however, this categorical approach has unintentionally resulted in federally funded programs operating in isolation from one another and in services being delivered apart from the regular instructional program of the school--even in spite of recent endeavors to change perceptions and practices.

The 1994 passage of the Improving America's Schools Act signaled a new era for ESEA. The IASA reauthorized the major ESEA programs through fiscal year 1999, retaining a focus on children with special learning needs but making important revisions. *(See Table at end of Part I--Overview of Key ESEA Programs.)* The redesigned ESEA emphasizes high expectations for all children, a schoolwide focus for improvement efforts, and stronger

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

partnerships among schools, parents, and communities. It stresses the need for States and school districts to raise student achievement, while de-emphasizing many specific process requirements that characterized prior law. And it promotes better integration of federal, State, and local programs as a strategy for producing better student results.

Federal Legislation to Support State and Local Reform

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the ESEA have distinct roles to play in supporting school improvement. Goals 2000 can help States and school districts lay the foundations of reform: establishing State and local content and performance standards, designing a system of assessments and accountability to determine if children are reaching the standards, planning how to use and coordinate available resources, and developing strategies to actively involve parents, teachers, and community members in school reform.

ESEA programs can complement the general reforms fostered by Goals 2000. ESEA ensures that the children who stand to benefit most from extra assistance--such as educationally deprived children, migratory children, immigrant children, limited-English-proficient children, homeless children, and Indian children--will receive high-quality instruction, extended learning time, and enriched educational experiences so that they, too, can meet challenging standards. ESEA programs also underwrite other critical components of school improvement, such as teacher professional development, educational technology, school safety, and drug abuse prevention. While each ESEA program can contribute in its own way to the bottom-line goal of increased learning for all students, the greatest potential for systemic reform ultimately comes from using the fiscal resources from all ESEA programs in an integrated, coordinated way.

Another relevant law passed in 1994 is the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. Jointly administered by the U.S. Department of Education and Department of Labor, this legislation spurs States and localities to develop better systems--as part of their overall school improvement efforts--that help youth make a smoother transition from school to good jobs or additional education.

Planning for Change

A strong plan lays the foundation for school reform. Whether a Title I schoolwide program plan or a Goals 2000 blueprint for reform, a good plan can present a compelling, shared vision for education and a structure for coordinating resources to make this vision a reality. It can engage key stakeholders in the reform process and set timetables and benchmarks for progress. A good plan can become a rallying point for everyone in the school, so that regular classroom teachers, special program staff, administrators, and students will see how their actions fit into a larger context and will pursue the same objectives.

Three stages of the planning process are particularly critical--establishing a vision, planning and integrating education programs in support of this vision, and sustaining ongoing improvement.

- ***establishing a vision:***

A vision for school improvement ultimately must come from States and localities. A vision will be meaningful only when the broader community has helped shape it and has assumed a sense of ownership for it. The vision must be conceived by teachers who know what works in the classroom, parents who want the best opportunities for their children, and community leaders who see the broader benefits of a strong educational system. In formulating a vision, States, districts, and schools must articulate what they expect their students to learn, how they want their teachers to teach, and how they want their schools to function as effective places for teaching and learning. Once a community has determined what is best for its children, it will be in a much better position to use federal dollars to provide maximum learning benefits for those children.

Both Goals 2000 and ESEA ask States and communities to start with their own visions of educational success, then identify the programs that will make it possible to achieve that vision--rather than starting with program requirements and working backwards. Looking at the needs of the whole school and the whole student is a more sensible and educationally sound approach than designing instruction solely to fit the parameters of funded programs.

Many States have begun their school improvement efforts by developing content and performance standards for students, which they then use to help clarify their visions, identify reform goals, and guide State and local planning.

- ***planning and integrating education programs in support of this vision:***

The revised ESEA calls upon States and communities to integrate federal programs with each other and with State and local programs, while keeping many of the law's special emphases and its focus on at-risk children. Program integration is emphasized not for its own sake, but because integrated programs have a better chance of raising achievement for all students, particularly at-risk children. When federal, State, and local programs are working toward the same goals, they create a synergy that can produce greater results for students than programs operating in isolation. Other possible benefits of integration are improved efficiency and lower administrative costs.

The law contains a number of strategies that make it easier for States and communities to plan programs around a common vision and integrate them with each other:

- **Schoolwide programs.** A key amendment to Title I, Part A made it possible for more high-poverty schools to operate schoolwide programs. Under prior law, schools could conduct schoolwide programs only if at least 75 percent of the children enrolled in the school or residing in the attendance area came from low-income families. The IASA lowered the poverty threshold for schoolwide eligibility to 60 percent for school year 1995-96 and to 50 percent for subsequent years, making an additional 12,000 schools eligible to operate schoolwide programs. Currently, there are approximately 8,500 schoolwide programs, an 87 percent increase from 1994-95. Buildings with schoolwide programs can use their Title I funds--as well as the vast majority of their other federal education funds and their State and local funding--to benefit all children in the school. They do not have to document separately the use of federal funds, as long as their activities upgrade the school's overall education program and meet the intent and purposes of each of the federal programs included. A school with a schoolwide program must conduct a needs assessment of the entire school. The school also must develop a comprehensive schoolwide plan that incorporates components of the schoolwide program and describes how the school will use federal, State, and local resources to implement these components. The comprehensive plan can be an excellent tool for encouraging educators to design programs around the needs of their students rather than administrative demands.

- **Consolidated planning.** To help promote a coherent approach to planning, the ESEA now permits States to develop a single consolidated plan covering several ESEA programs and federal vocational education grants, instead of separate plans for each program. Forty-nine States have submitted consolidated plans to the U.S. Department of Education. The plans describe each State's general goals for all students and its strategies for designing and integrating ESEA programs to further these goals. Although consolidated planning does not relieve States of federal program requirements, it does enable them to plan how to use all of their federal funds to support overall State goals. A similar ESEA provision allows local educational agencies (LEAs) to submit a single consolidated plan to their States. The Department of Education has made guidance available on submitting consolidated State plans. *(See Appendix B--Guidance Documents Issued by the U.S. Department of Education for ESEA, Goals 2000, and Related Programs.)*

- **Consolidated administrative funds.** ESEA also permits States to consolidate funds for State administration received under various ESEA programs and Goals 2000, as long as the majority of their administrative resources comes from non-federal sources. A similar provision authorizes local educational agencies, with State approval, to consolidate their local administrative funds from ESEA programs. These provisions make it easier to plan across programs.

- **Waivers.** For the first time since the ESEA was originally enacted, States and school districts can apply to the Secretary of Education for waivers of federal program requirements that impede them from carrying out their overall visions of school

reform. This ESEA waiver option--as well as similar waiver options in Goals 2000 and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act--provides greater latitude for States and districts to plan their reform visions and determine how to use ESEA funds to advance those visions. When a specific federal program requirement is an obstacle to effectively using ESEA funds to serve the intended target groups, a State or district can seek a waiver of that provision. *(Waiver opportunities are explained in more detail in Part II, theme 4. Also see Box--New Waiver Opportunities in Federal Education Programs, and Appendix B--Guidance Documents Issued by the U.S Department of Education for ESEA, Goals 2000, and Related Programs.)*

Hattiesburg, MS: One Plan, Not Eight Plans

In 1994, with funds from the former Chapter 2, more than 300 educators, parents, and citizens in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, spent countless hours developing a districtwide strategic plan that would chart a community vision for school reform. The resulting plan addressed all important components of the educational system--including curriculum, instruction, staff development, assessment, parent and community involvement, school organization, and school climate--and aimed to prepare all Hattiesburg students to become analytical thinkers, lifelong learners, and productive citizens. The plan contained specific objectives, such as annually improving student test scores and attendance, and spelled out specific strategies, such as implementing curricula based on voluntary content standards and encouraging students to undertake community service projects.

But the real impact of the plan would depend on whether individual school sites embraced it. In 1995-96, using Goals 2000 funding, the Hattiesburg school district again worked with educators, parents, and community people, this time to initiate similar school-community plans at the building level. This strategic planning process has also become the vehicle for Title I schoolwide program planning and parent-school compacts. (All Hattiesburg elementary schools and one middle school have Title I schoolwide programs.) Site planners are encouraged to specify what they want to accomplish, then "figure out how they will apply time, money, and human resources" from all available sources to achieve their goals, according to Perrin Lowrey, director of planning and evaluation. "We need one plan, not eight plans," Lowrey explained. "It's important that we're all in the same canoe, we all have a paddle, and we all know where we're going."

- ***sustaining ongoing improvement:***

The revised ESEA links federal program accountability with the same accountability measures--based on challenging State standards and assessments--that each State uses to measure progress of all its children. These new accountability strategies are intended not only to improve coordination of federal programs with State reforms, but also to promote high

expectations for all children and instill in federal programs a culture of accountability and continual improvement.

The most influential new accountability provisions are found in Title I. State standards and assessments form the framework of a Title I accountability approach that rewards the continued success of schools and districts and takes corrective actions for repeated failure to help at-risk students progress adequately toward State standards. This accountability approach is also connected to a formative evaluation process. Educators are encouraged to use Title I assessment results to revise their classroom instruction and develop learning experiences to help all students meet State standards. Provisions linking accountability to State and local standards can be found in several other programs including Migrant Education, Bilingual Education, Indian Education, and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program.

Ongoing improvement is also an important part of State and local reforms under Goals 2000. A primary objective of Goals 2000 is to catalyze development of high-quality State assessments to monitor students' progress toward State and local performance standards. States must have procedures in place for revitalizing schools that are not making adequate progress. States will also monitor the progress of themselves and their local educational agencies in carrying out State and local improvement plans.

The ESEA and Goals 2000 improvement strategies revolve around far more than assessment and external rewards and sanctions, however. Primarily they depend on teachers and parents--those persons who are closest to children--possessing the authority, information, and training to improve teaching and learning, and accepting the responsibility to intervene until all children achieve at higher levels. To foster the conditions in which this kind of "self-generated" accountability can thrive, the federal legislation furnishes additional supports, such as professional development and technical assistance, greater decisionmaking authority at the school level, stronger parental involvement, and annual reviews of school and district progress in raising student performance.

Shelby County, KY: Deciding What Students Need and Making It Happen

District transformation plans are a cornerstone of the Kentucky Education Reform Act, which propelled a massive overhaul of the State educational system. As with other Kentucky school districts, planning in the Shelby County Public Schools comes down to answering two questions: What do our students need? And how do we make it happen?

In the past, district planners often worked backwards from grant requirements, without fully considering the broader needs of the district. "I would receive a Title II application, see the kinds of things that I could and could not do, then I would design a project that fit those goals," said Molly Sullivan, director of curriculum in Shelby County. "Now we assess the county program needs before deciding how best to use our funds." When Shelby County teachers and administrators developed a district transformation plan for 1996-98, they first did a needs assessment. Based on the results, they determined priorities for reform, then planned activities and strategies to address those priorities. "Once we have identified all of our activities," Sullivan explained, "then we look at our available budget and the kinds of things that they are designed to support and the kinds of things that they cannot support." The more targeted funding programs are budgeted first, saving more flexible authorities, such as ESEA Title VI (the former Chapter 2), to pay for activities that cannot be supported from targeted programs.

After looking at assessment results and other indicators, Shelby County planners realized that their greatest need, prekindergarten through grade 12, was for improved science education. With funding from Goals 2000 and other sources, the district is pursuing a multi-pronged approach to reform science instruction. A science resource teacher provides instructional suggestions, materials, modeling, and training to all schools. Teachers engage in professional development concerning effective science curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods. Students conduct experiments and projects inside and outside their classrooms and participate eagerly in after-school science clubs at least once a week. Some effects of this concerted attention are already emerging. Elementary teachers are doing a better job of integrating science content into a variety of instructional areas, such as reading. Teachers are talking more among themselves about how to improve science teaching. "More children are doing good minds-on, hands-on science," observed Kricket McClure, Shelby County science resource teacher, "and it has to pay off."

Walsh and Pembina Counties, ND: A True Community Vision

Inspired by Goals 2000 funding, nearly 70 citizens of Walsh and Pembina Counties, North Dakota, met intensively over several months of 1995 to develop a plan to improve teaching and learning in 17 small, rural school districts covering a wide region. Teachers, counselors, administrators, parents, religious leaders, civic leaders, and employers met in eight committees to draft a plan that identified strategies for achieving the National Education Goals. At a large public meeting, over 150 citizens from the wider community debated, revised, added to, and prioritized the draft strategies. "We had one of the largest gymnasiums in the area filled with moms, dads, and business leaders," said Bernie Burley, special projects coordinator for the North Valley Vo-Tech Center. "This was far more than rubberstamping," he explained. "At that meeting, the farm family who lived several miles from town had as much power as the school board members."

From this process emerged 34 strategies that set a course for reform, in many cases spelling out the "who," "what," "when," "where," and "how." One strategy, for example, concerns more effective use of technology; it calls on districts to provide all teachers with professional development in technology, to encourage teachers to use technology for assignments and recordkeeping, and to install computers in every classroom by May 31, 1997. Other strategies include providing professional development in effective teaching techniques at all grades, mounting a coordinated drug-free schools effort, and upgrading the quality of kindergarten programs. Since most of the affected school districts received Goals 2000 grants of less than $2,000, they are drawing upon other resources to implement the strategies, such as ESEA Titles II and IV, School-to-Work Opportunities, Head Start, and State, local, and foundation dollars.

TABLE: OVERVIEW OF KEY ESEA PROGRAMS

Title I	**Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards**
Part A	Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies: Supports local educational agencies in improving teaching and learning to help low-achieving students in high-poverty schools meet the same challenging State content and performance standards that apply to all students. Promotes effective instructional strategies that increase the amount and quality of learning time for at-risk children and that deliver an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Also expands eligibility of schools for schoolwide programs that serve all children in high-poverty schools; encourages school-based planning; establishes accountability based on results; promotes effective parental participation; and supports coordination with health and social services.
Part B	Even Start Family Literacy: Improves the educational opportunities of low-income families by integrating early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education into a unified family literacy program.
Part C	Education of Migratory Children: Supports educational programs for migratory children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves. Helps provide migratory children with the same opportunities as other children to meet challenging State content and performance standards. Targets efforts on the most mobile children, whose schooling is most likely to be disrupted.
Part D	Education of Neglected and Delinquent Youth: Extends educational services and learning time in State institutions and community-day programs for neglected or delinquent children and youth. Encourages smooth transitions to enable participants to continue schooling or enter the job market upon leaving the institution. Supports programs in which school districts collaborate with locally operated correctional facilities to prepare youth in these facilities for high school completion, training, and employment and to operate dropout prevention programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Title II	**Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development** Concentrates on upgrading the expertise of teachers and other school staff to enable them to teach all children to challenging State content standards. Supports sustained and intensive high-quality professional development, focused on achieving high performance standards in mathematics, science, and other core academic subjects.
Title III	**Technology for Education** Technology for Education of All Students: Creates a broad authority for challenge grants to develop and demonstrate technology to help all students meet challenging content standards, as well as for projects to design better technology-based learning tools and resources in the areas of literacy, English as a Second Language, and school-to-work transition. Star Schools: Supports partnerships to provide distance learning services, equipment, and facilities and encourages national leadership activities.
Title IV	**Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities** Supports Goal Seven of the National Education Goals by encouraging comprehensive approaches to make schools and neighborhoods safe and drug-free. Provides funds to governors, State educational agencies (SEAs), LEAs, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit entities for a variety of drug and violence prevention programs.
Title V	**Promoting Equity** Magnet Schools Assistance: Promotes desegregation through magnet school programs that are part of an approved desegregation plan and that attract students from different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds with a distinctive curriculum.
Title VI	**Innovative Education Program Strategies** Provides broad support for activities that encourage school reform and educational innovation.

Title VII	**Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs**
	Bilingual Education: Helps ensure that limited-English-proficient children have the same opportunities to achieve the same high performance standards as all other children. Builds local capacity to provide high-quality bilingual programs.
	Immigrant Education: Supports LEAs that have had recent, significant increases in immigrant student populations, emphasizing transition services and coordination of education for immigrants with regular educational services.
	Foreign Language Assistance: Assists State or local educational agencies in carrying out innovative model programs that establish, improve, or expand foreign language studies for elementary and secondary school students.
Title VIII	**Impact Aid**
	Provides financial assistance to LEAs whose local revenues or enrollments are adversely affected by federal activities, including the federal acquisition of real property, or the enrollment of children who reside on tax-exempt federal property or reside with a parent employed on tax-exempt federal property.
Title IX	**Indian Education**
	Indian Education: Supports LEA efforts to meet the special educational and culturally related academic needs of American Indians and Alaska Natives, so that these children can achieve the same challenging State standards expected of all students.
	Native Hawaiians: Supports supplemental educational programs to assist Native Hawaiians in reaching the National Education Goals.

Title X **Programs of National Significance**

Javits Gifted and Talented Education: Supports State and local efforts to improve the education of gifted and talented students.

Public Charter Schools: Provides seed money for the development and initial implementation of public charter schools, in order to demonstrate how increased flexibility within public school systems can produce better results for children.

Other Title X programs include the Fund for the Improvement of Education; Civics Education; Arts Education; and Inexpensive Book Distribution.

Title XI **Coordinated Services**

Allows LEAs, schools, and consortia of schools to use five percent or less of the funds they receive under ESEA to develop, implement, or expand coordinated services that increase children's and parents' access to social, health, and educational services.

Title XIII **Support and Assistance Programs to Improve Education**

Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers: Builds a comprehensive, accessible network of 15 technical assistance centers that link schools, districts, States, and the U.S. Department of Education to improve access to and exchange of information and assistance about federal programs and school reform.

Title XIV **General Provisions**

Provides a general waiver authority for federal education programs to allow flexibility in return for clear accountability for improved student performance. Authorizes consolidated plans and consolidation of administrative funds. Establishes uniform provisions governing maintenance of effort and equitable participation of private school students and teachers. Requires States receiving ESEA funds to have a State law mandating expulsion of students who bring weapons to school. Permits LEAs, with State approval, to use unneeded funds under any ESEA program (other than Title I, Part A) for another ESEA program.

II. Improving Teaching and Learning with ESEA Resources

The five guiding themes of the ESEA offer a framework for thinking about and implementing school reform with ESEA resources. The specific programs authorized in the law support these five themes individually and collectively.

The sections that follow describe key provisions of the ESEA that relate to each of the five themes. They discuss how States, districts, and schools can apply these provisions to pursue high student achievement and their own broad school reform goals. Boxed examples show how State and local people are integrating ESEA and other resources in real-world situations to improve teaching and learning.

The discussion that follows does not try to list every ESEA program or provision that pertains to each theme, nor does it delve into any one program in detail (although some key provisions, such as Title I schoolwide programs, appear under more than one theme). Instead it offers information and ideas about the range of ESEA resources available to schools and how these resources can be applied to critical school improvement needs.

Theme 1. High standards for all children--with the elements of education aligned, so that everything is working together to help all students reach those standards

When children are not achieving to high levels, one response is to expect less. But research and experience have shown that when teachers, parents, and other influential adults expect all students to reach high standards, children will learn more and perform at higher levels. This theme of high standards in the ESEA signals that no child should be held to lowered expectations; each is expected to acquire the knowledge and skills to become a productive citizen in the 21st century. Experience also suggests that regardless of amount, resources will have the greatest impact when they are marshalled toward the achievement of a demanding goal and when all parts of the education system are aligned around the same goals.

■ ***High standards that apply to* all *students.*** Regardless of the program or the child's needs, the same high standards must apply. As Vermont's Green Mountain Challenge States, "High standards for all students--no exceptions, no excuses." ESEA calls on schools to raise standards for all children--and all means all.

- The primary goal of the new Title I, Part A is to enable disadvantaged children to meet the same challenging standards that each State has established for all its children. States, districts, and schools are asked to make a powerful break with past practice, replacing minimum standards for some children with challenging standards for all. The same high academic standards used for Title I also apply to students served

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

throughout all ESEA programs, including Migrant Education, Indian Education, Bilingual Education, and others.

- Under Title I, States submit plans demonstrating that they have developed--or will develop by school year 1997-98--challenging academic content standards in math and reading/language arts, at a minimum. States also must define two levels of high performance--proficient and advanced--and a partially proficient level that can be used to determine whether children are learning the material in their content standards. To promote one set of challenging standards, States that have developed standards for all their students under Goals 2000 or another State process must use those standards for ESEA. Only in the absence of overall standards for all children may States develop standards specifically for Title I.

- High standards for teaching and learning also apply to educational programs in State juvenile facilities. In the Title I, Part D program for neglected and delinquent youth, juvenile correctional institutions must provide at least 20 hours of weekly instruction as a condition for receiving federal funds. This doubles the amount of instruction now required of juvenile facilities, bringing it more in line with what local school districts offer.

- Title VII discretionary grants aim to help LEP students develop full proficiency in English while they build achievement in all curricular areas, so that these students will reach the same challenging standards as all other children.

- The Title IX Indian Education program, like other ESEA programs, supports high standards for Indian students--the same as for all students. Title IX requires school districts to specify in their funding applications the performance goals that they will use for Indian students, their plans for addressing student needs through federal, State, and local programs, and their strategies for assessing student progress. The law also charges States with new roles and responsibilities to ensure that Indian children and adults are adequately educated.

EXAMPLE OF NORTH DAKOTA'S ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS CONTENT STANDARDS FOR GRADE 4

Students gather and organize information effectively through reading, writing, listening, and speaking. They achieve the benchmarks if they:

- Understand the story elements, e.g., character, setting, conflict, plot, theme.
- Understand the main idea and supporting details.
- Use context clues to determine the meaning of words, e.g., root words, prefixes, suffixes, compound words, affixes, multiple meanings, key words, antonyms, synonyms, word families, syntax clues, semantic clues, context clues.
- Use simple organizational structures, e.g., lists, introduction, body, conclusions.
- Use simple reference tools, e.g., glossary, dictionary, globe, encyclopedia.
- Use vocabulary knowledge to gather information.
- Understand verbal and non-verbal cues.
- Use speaking and listening to enhance comprehension, e.g., conversations, interviews, collaborative groups, taking turns.
- Understand that creating mental pictures helps increase understanding, e.g., poetic images, figurative language.

■ ***Alignment of all educational components.*** Challenging standards are much more likely to be met if the other important elements of teaching and learning--including assessments, instructional materials, and professional development--are aligned with the standards. Some States have explicit standards and curricula that are not well coordinated with other aspects of their educational system. For example, if State assessments are not tied to standards, then teachers have incentive to teach the content tested rather than the content embraced in the

standards. The new ESEA encourages alignment of all major components affecting teaching and learning.

- As envisioned under the new law, challenging academic standards serve as the focal point for improving curriculum, instruction, professional development, school leadership, student assessment, parental involvement, and other key aspects of education.

- ESEA assessment and accountability are integrated with general State standards-based reforms. Assessment will focus on what matters--what students need to know and be able to do--rather than on what students across the country knew several years ago when norms were developed for the standardized tests in use today.

- Professional development opportunities in the new Eisenhower Title II program and other federal programs center on preparing educators to help all children meet challenging State standards in core academic subjects.

Baltimore County, MD: Aligning Professional Development with High Standards

With a Goals 2000 grant and involvement of Towson State University, Baltimore County public schools are using school-based professional development to better prepare current and prospective teachers to help students reach State content and performance standards. At planning institutes in 1995, classroom teachers, university faculty, and principals developed strategies to reshape three district schools as "professional development schools," in which preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and teacher educators work, learn, and confer together to improve instruction and raise student achievement. All 100-plus teachers in the three schools are encouraged to participate in standards-based professional development, with the ultimate aim of spreading the professional development school model to other district sites and embedding it into preservice training for all Maryland teacher education candidates. In Baltimore County, professional development has addressed such topics as high expectations, State performance assessments, effective reading instruction, mathematics content standards, and teaching for at-risk students. To promote best practices, teachers also observe other classrooms and engage in dialogue with outstanding teachers and university faculty.

THEME 2. A FOCUS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

High standards set goals for students, but it is everyday teaching and learning--along with the relationship between teacher and student--that motivates and equips students to reach goals. In addition to high standards, several other elements are critical for effective teaching and learning. These include professional development that prepares teachers to teach to

challenging standards; high quality curricula and instruction; and technical assistance and support.

- ***Professional development.*** No matter how effective a particular instructional approach or organizational structure, it will have little impact without the informed backing of teachers and other school staff. Teachers must possess content knowledge and effective teaching skills to help children learn to high standards. Recognizing this, most of the programs under the ESEA include a renewed focus on professional development tied to challenging standards, and permit federal funds to be used for professional development for teachers, other school staff, administrators, and parents. *(See Box--ESEA Programs That Can Support Professional Development Activities.)*

ESEA Programs That Can Support Professional Development Activities

Title I	Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards (LEA Grants, Even Start, Migrant, Neglected and Delinquent)
Title II	Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development
Title III	Technology for Education
Title IV	Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
Title VI	Innovative Education Program Strategies
Title VII	Bilingual Education: Capacity and Demonstration Grants; Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination; Training for All Teachers Program; Foreign Language Assistance Program
Title IX	Indian Education Formula Grants to LEAs; Special Programs for Indian Children; Native Hawaiian Curriculum Development, Teacher Training, and Recruitment Program
Title X	Fund for the Improvement of Education; Gifted and Talented; Arts in Education; Civic Education; Charter Schools
Title XI	Coordinated Services
Title XIII	Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers; Eisenhower Regional Consortia

- The revised Title II Eisenhower Professional Development program constitutes the largest source of federal funding for sustained, intensive, high-quality professional development, tied to challenging State standards in mathematics, science, and other core academic subjects. Most Title II-funded efforts focus on teacher improvement in math and science, consistent with professional development plans designed and implemented by school districts and schools. Teachers and principals play a critical role in determining the kinds of training they need. The refurbished Eisenhower program is driving a shift from one-time "inservice" workshops toward more lasting professional development efforts integrated into the daily life of the school. Title II funds also help institutions of higher education and other organizations develop their capacity to offer high-quality professional development. Moreover, funds may support clearinghouses, professional development institutes, and networks of teachers and administrators.

- Title II funds can be used in conjunction with other professional development efforts, such as those under Title I or Title VII. Working together, the ESEA programs can enhance the capabilities of districts and schools to meet the needs of today's diverse students.

- Title I, too, emphasizes high-quality teaching and professional development. State, district, and schoolwide Title I plans must describe how teachers and other staff will participate in professional development to help low-achieving students meet challenging standards. Schools identified for improvement under the Title I accountability process must increase professional development opportunities.

- Title VI (formerly Chapter 2) may support professional development activities in a range of areas, including activities consistent with Goals 2000 and similar reforms. For example, Title VI funds can be used to train teachers and other school staff to use technology effectively as part of a school reform program.

- Title VII supports professional development that promotes high-quality instruction for LEP students. Title VII authorizes competitive grants to institutions of higher education, States, and districts to upgrade preservice and inservice education for teachers and other educational personnel.

- Goals 2000 emphasizes professional development to help educators increase student learning in accordance with State reform goals. Ninety percent of each State's Goals 2000 grant must be passed along to school districts and schools, in the form of subgrants for planning and implementing local reforms and for improving teacher preservice education and professional development.

New Castle, DE: Bringing Coherence to Professional Development

Colonial School District in New Castle, Delaware, has coordinated funding from ESEA Titles I, II, IV, and V, the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, and State and local sources to bring greater coherence to professional development across the district. All professional development in the system is aligned with State content standards and new district curricular reforms, is rooted in research on teaching and learning, and is focused on Colonial's overarching goal: "To improve the academic achievement of all students."

Each school has a team of teachers, administrators, parents, and others, which develops a schoolwide plan for improving student achievement. The district's Learning Division coordinates professional development by looking at information from school plans, a districtwide teacher need survey, and the district's curricular reform goals, then plugging in professional development funding from all sources. Recent training has focused on implementation of new curricula in language arts, math, social studies, and science, and on instructional management. "We're weaving curriculum with training, with assessment, and with instructional strategies," explained Linda F. Poole, director of learning. "We're combining dollars, planning, purposes, and goals."

Benefits have already begun to accrue from Colonial's coordinated approach. Total involvement in professional development has increased from about 8,000 person-training hours in 1992-93 to more than 13,000 person-training hours in 1995-96. Training has become longer in duration and more intensive--courses of several days instead of a few hours, followed by ongoing practice, feedback, reflection, and coaching in the participants' own classrooms. More staff development is taking place at individual school sites, as teachers share what they have learned at the district's Teaching and Learning Center with colleagues in their buildings.

■ ***Curricula and instruction.*** The amended ESEA attempts to build on a decade of research about how children learn and which instructional techniques are most effective. For example, we now know the importance of content-rich instruction for all children at every stage of development. We know that technology, when carefully implemented, can enliven teaching, tailor instruction to individual learning styles, and connect classrooms with a vast world of information. ESEA programs provide support for curricula and instruction aligned with broader classroom reforms.

- The Title I legislation accentuates several key components for Title I programs--whether schoolwide or targeted assistance programs--that are supported by research. These components include instructional strategies based on effective means of improving student achievement; high-quality curriculum; highly qualified professional staff; extended learning time (such as extended-year and before- and after-school

programs); comprehensive needs assessment; strong program coordination; and strong results-based accountability.

- As noted above, for the first time in Title I law, a schoolwide program can combine funds from the vast majority of its federal programs into a coherent reform program. With the opportunity to integrate all programs, strategies, and resources, all staff in these schools can concentrate on improving the quality of teaching and learning for all students in the school.

- Title I "targeted assistance schools"--those that are ineligible for or choose not to develop a Title I schoolwide program--must target Title I funds only on eligible children who are failing, or are most at risk of failing, to meet State standards. Even so, 1994 revisions encourage targeted assistance schools to better coordinate Title I services with the regular instructional program of the school and to include Title I in overall school planning and improvement efforts. For example, teachers and other school staff funded by Title I may teach collaboratively with regular classroom teachers, if such collaborative teaching directly benefits students participating in Title I.

Boston, MA: Leveraging Funds for Schoolwide Improvement

Samuel W. Mason Elementary in the Roxbury section of Boston used to be one of the least-chosen schools in the city under the district's controlled school choice plan. Now the school is filled to capacity, with a waiting list. Student achievement at Mason has increased steadily over a three-year period and has exceeded the citywide average for reading, including advanced reading comprehension. Parent involvement has increased from 6 percent attendance at some parent activities to 94 percent. And for two consecutive years, 1994 and 1995, Mason won the prestigious City of Boston Management Excellence award, never before given to a public school.

This transformation has been fueled in part by innovative leveraging of Title I dollars in a schoolwide program. "We looked at dollars from the city and Title I as a lump sum, and we had the flexibility to do it," said principal Mary Russo. At-risk children, LEP children, and children with disabilities are fully included in all classes. Teaching for at-risk children has shifted from a remedial approach to an accelerated approach based on the best instructional practices from reading and writing research.

Title I schoolwide status has enabled Mason Elementary to use instructional staff more flexibly and reduce teacher-pupil ratios from 26:1 to 13:1 for part of the day. In the morning, groups of teachers--including a three-member "literacy team" of specially skilled teachers--work with clusters of children in grades 1-5; students are matched to teachers according to learning styles. In the afternoon, the literacy team works with kindergarten and early childhood teachers in an early literacy program for three- to five-year-olds. "Instead of serving 30 or 40 children in pullout programs, Title I was leveraged with other resources to affect all teachers and all students," Russo explained.

- Title III, a new authority under the ESEA, promotes the use of educational technology to support school reform. Schools can use Title III assistance to adopt educational technology that enhances curricula, instruction, and administrative support. Both the new technology challenge grants program and the continued Star Schools program for distance learning support innovative uses of technology with the ultimate goals of helping students reach high standards.

- Support for effectively integrating technology into teaching and learning is also available from the Title II Eisenhower program and the Title VI innovation program, either alone or as a complement to Title III. Both Titles II and VI may be used to train teachers to use instructional technology effectively. Title VI funds may also be used to purchase computer hardware and software for instructional use.

Union City, NJ: Technology As Resource for Instructional Reform

Threatened with State takeover, the Union City, New Jersey, school district launched a massive restructuring and curriculum reform in 1990. The district's high need and interest attracted the attention of Bell Atlantic Corporation, which wanted to become involved in a program to demonstrate how interactive, multimedia technology could foster education reform. Thus was born Project Explore, a program based at Christopher Columbus School--a public middle school housed in an old parochial school. In September 1993, corporate and local funding provided the whole seventh grade class and their teachers with numerous computers at school and at home. Digital subscriber lines and audio/video server technology were later integrated into the network.

Federal funds from Title I, Bilingual Education, and other programs have helped support curricular reforms across the district that stress development of high-level thinking skills. Columbus students are expected to demonstrate proficiencies by writing research papers and completing projects. Students and teachers in Project Explore use e-mail to communicate with each other and turn in and evaluate homework. Parents, including many with limited English proficiency, send frequent e-mail messages to school and take an active interest in the children's use of computers. Currently the district is using funds from the National Science Foundation and other sources to equip all the grades at Christopher Columbus with the kinds of technology that have enriched Project Explore. Meanwhile, Project Explore--along with the home computers--has followed the original cohort of students into the 10th grade at Emerson High School for 1996-97.

Both the curricular reforms and the investment in technology appear to be paying off. Union City students are consistently outperforming other special needs districts in the State by approximately 27 percentage points in reading, writing, and math on the State Early Warning Test. Students in Project Explore are doing even better. In writing, for example, the average 9th grade score of the Explore cohort was 71.2, compared with 50.3 for Union City as a whole. Among these students, attendance is high, and the dropout rate has decreased to a very low level.

- Two major programs that help schools handle the challenges of effectively instructing LEP students are Title I and Title VII. LEP students are eligible for Title I services on the same basis as other children. Title VII programs, in turn, must be coordinated with Title I. *(See Box--How Title I and Title VII Can Work Together to Help Schools, Districts, and States Raise the Performance of LEP Students.)* Title VI can also be used to improve instruction for LEP children.

How Title I and Title VII Can Work Together to Help Schools, Districts, and States Raise the Performance of LEP Students

With continuing growth in the number of LEP students, SEAs and LEAs face special challenges in raising performance of LEP students. The revised ESEA contains several provisions that can help SEAs and LEAs use Title VII and Title I in a more coordinated way to improve achievement of LEP students.

- The overriding purpose of both Title I and Title VII is the same--helping participants reach challenging State standards established for all children. The purpose of Title I is to help disadvantaged children "acquire the knowledge and skills contained in the challenging State content standards and to meet the challenging State performance standards developed for all children." The purpose of Title VII is "to educate limited English proficient children and youth to meet the same rigorous standards for academic performance expected of all children and youth, including meeting challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards in academic areas."

- Both Title I and Title VII promote coordination, schoolwide programs, and comprehensive reform. Title VII, Subpart 1 has four discretionary grants: Program Development and Implementation grants to initiate new programs; Program Enhancement grants to expand or enhance State and locally funded programs; five-year Comprehensive School grants to develop and implement schoolwide bilingual education programs; and five-year Systemwide Improvement grants to develop and implement districtwide programs that serve all or almost all LEP students. As in Title I, Title VII grantees must ensure that programs are not isolated from the overall school programs. Schools with Title I schoolwide programs may combine their Title VII funds with their Title I funds for comprehensive reform. In addition, under Title VII Comprehensive Schools grants, schools with high concentrations of LEP students may implement schoolwide bilingual or special alternative instructional programs to upgrade all relevant programs and activities serving all LEP students. Coordination of Title I and Title VII through schoolwide approaches can ensure access of LEP students to the full mainstream curriculum.

- Both Title I and Title VII encourage schoolwide staff development. Most teachers serving LEP students have little training in how second-language acquisition and cultural diversity influence learning or the educational experiences of students. Only about one-third of those who teach LEP students have ever taken college courses addressing these issues. Titles I and VII recognize that staff development is key to increasing the performance of all students. Title I requires and Title VII encourages recipients to demonstrate how they will provide intensive, sustained professional development to help all teachers teach to challenging State standards.

- Title I and Title VII promote increased parental involvement. Participation of parents of LEP students in school activities tends to be low, in the aggregate; thus, improving parental participation is a vital step in boosting LEP student achievement. Parental involvement is a major theme of the ESEA as reflected, for example, in the Title I school-parent compacts. More effective cooperation among staff supported by Title I and Title VII can go a long way toward increasing participation of parents of LEP students. For example, Title I requires schools and LEAs to "ensure, to the extent possible, that information related to school and parent programs, meetings, and other activities is sent to the homes of participating children in the language used in such homes."

- The IASA supports a comprehensive system of technical assistance. Comprehensive regional technical assistance centers promise to enhance Title I and Title VII coordination compared with the prior arrangement of different centers for the two programs. *(See the following section on "technical assistance and support.")*

- LEAs have flexibility under ESEA to develop sensible local arrangements for meeting the needs of LEP children. Schools and districts can coordinate resources, staff, and services under Title I and Title VII to produce a sound, effective instructional program. For example--

  √ Title I funds may be used to pay the salaries of instructional staff who work with students having academic difficulties, including LEP students. These staff could work closely with ESL/bilingual teachers and regular classroom teachers.

  √ With Title I aid, a school district could develop an accelerated before- and after-school program for LEP students. One type of program would pair high school and elementary school students for activities such as shared reading and writing time. Guided reading, math, and science activities and reinforcement of content concepts studied during the day would also be an integral part of these sessions.

  √ A school district could use Title I funds for an accelerated summer academic program for LEP students to fortify the literacy skills and content knowledge developed during the school year. One type of program would group Title I-eligible LEP students by grade level, teaming them with English-proficient Title I students. This affords the LEP students extra opportunities to use English. The content-based language instruction program would be taught by a team of teachers, pairing a bilingual and non-bilingual staff member in each class. A variety of activities such as field trips are a vital part of the instructional program and provide opportunities for enriched language experiences.

Lamar, CO: Raising Achievement of LEP Children through a Schoolwide Program

In the Colorado prairie town of Lamar, educators at Lincoln Elementary have woven together funds from Titles I-A, I-C, II, IV, VI, and VII of ESEA and from the State's English Language Proficiency Act to implement a combined schoolwide Title I-Title VII program. Boosting achievement of LEP students is a major goal of the schoolwide program. More than 90 percent of the school's children are from low-income families, 71 percent are Hispanic, and 60 percent are limited-English-proficient. The schoolwide concept has resulted in "a 180 degree attitude change," according to federal programs coordinator Diana Rankin, transforming Lincoln School "from the 'outcast' school to the 'prominent' school that other schools want to emulate." And scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills have risen throughout the school.

Drawing on the resources of their regional technical assistance center, teachers at Lincoln are implementing the best research-based instructional practices for all children, particularly LEP children. To make time for a once-a-week in-school staff planning session, Lamar added 15 minutes to the school day four days a week; teachers use this weekly time for joint problem solving, curriculum development, and decisions about how to use resources. Teaching strategies have shifted from providing pullout English as a Second Language (ESL) services to strengthening the ability of all classroom teachers to work with LEP children. With ESEA support, teachers are receiving intensive staff development, including a Spanish language and culture immersion course. As a result, seven teachers expect to obtain ESL endorsements this school year and one expects to receive a bilingual teaching certificate.

The extra funding from ESEA has enabled Lincoln School to hire additional elementary classroom teachers, support more teaching assistants to work with LEP children, and establish a bilingual computer lab. The school has also instituted an extended-day kindergarten, a summer school program, drug-abuse prevention education, and parent activities, including evening ESL training for parents.

■ ***Technical assistance and support.*** Schoolwide reform is hard work. To carry out their new responsibilities under ESEA, States, districts, and schools may need information and assistance. The ESEA contains new avenues for providing technical assistance. In addition, the Department of Education has taken several steps to upgrade the quality and availability of technical assistance.

- To improve the design and operation of schoolwide programs, Title I now requires each State to design a system of school support teams, composed of experienced teachers and others who are knowledgeable about research and practice. These teams will help schools to devise, implement, review, and refine schoolwide programs, with a focus on reforming instruction and raising performance of all disadvantaged children.

Texas Education Agency: School Support Teams as Change Agents

A 1994-95 Texas pilot program brought school support teams (SSTs) to 12 sites across the State. Currently each of the 20 regional service centers in the State is striving to provide SSTs to keep pace with the dramatic increase in the number of Texas schoolwide programs. This is evident in Region III, where the number of schoolwide program campuses increased from 34 in 1995-96 to 70-plus this year. Composed of exemplary educators, experienced administrators, college faculty, and technical assistance personnel from across a region, SSTs are "external change agents" that help guide Title I schoolwide programs through the processes of setting school improvement goals, planning effective actions to change school practice, and productively using all resources to reach high performance goals.

In 1995-96, each school slated for SST assistance received a "pre-visit" by the team coordinator, an on-site visit by the entire team, phone and mail support from team members, and a follow-up visit later in the school year. An evaluation of the pilot year of the Texas SST initiative found that it had stimulated changes that have the potential to improve curriculum, instruction, school organization, and, ultimately, student academic success. "One of the outstanding attributes of the SSTs is their ability to respond to each unique school situation," observed Ann Fiala of the Region III Education Service Center. "In our region, each of the support visits has a slightly different look." For example, SSTs may review school improvement plans and make recommendations, examine the components of schoolwide programs, provide appropriate staff development, or help implement instructional technology in a new way. "It takes time to build the trusting relationship that is essential to the SST process," said Fiala, noting that schools must be willing to share their strengths and their aspirations for student success.

- Schools that make exceptional progress under Title I will be designated as distinguished schools by the State, with the mission of providing support to other schools in need of improvement. Title I also charges States with establishing a corps of distinguished educators--teachers from outstanding schools who provide intensive assistance to the schools and districts that are farthest from meeting State standards.

- Title XIII restructures federally funded technical assistance to give States, districts, and schools better access to high-quality information, and to promote coordinated technical services and coherent strategies across all ESEA programs. Fifteen comprehensive regional technical assistance centers serve the nation. These one-stop centers for all ESEA programs can serve educators far more effectively than the previous system of dozens of centers that focused on individual programs in isolation from one another. The comprehensive centers assist with school-based professional development. They provide direct access to new ideas through technology and encourage expansion of

professional networks of teachers and other school staff. As required by law, the Department of Education is coordinating its other technical assistance activities to work in concert with the centers. *(See Appendix A--Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers.)*

- The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education is taking a more integrated approach to federal program reviews. In the past, a team of Departmental staff would go into the field to review a specific program, such as Title I. Under the new system of integrated program reviews, a team composed of Departmental staff from several different programs--for example, Title I, Part A, Migrant Education, and Title II--conduct comprehensive reviews of the federal elementary and secondary programs in a State or district. The purpose is to provide technical assistance to State and local people on program integration and effective educational strategies. The Department is currently adding other programs, such as bilingual education and special education, to these integrated reviews.

North Dakota: An Integrated Program Review

North Dakota was the site of the first integrated program review across an entire State agency conducted by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Staff from all programs administered by the Department's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education joined with representatives of the Offices of Vocational and Adult Education, Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, and Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. ED looked at how federal funds from the programs involved were being coordinated to improve services to children. The Department also provided technical assistance on program compliance and learned more about State reform efforts.

The SEA, the LEAs involved, and ED benefitted in several respects from this integrated approach. State officials from a variety of program areas sat at the same table discussing how to coordinate teaching and learning options, and in the process formed new relationships and gained greater understanding of how their roles were interconnected. Suggestions from the ED team helped the SEA and LEAs consider new ways to use federal, State, and local funds to improve teaching and learning. ED also provided technical assistance on such issues as how to pool resources, use waivers, and compile multiple data sources to show the outcomes of Title I schoolwide programs. Staff from the Office of Vocational and Adult Education discussed with State officials the upcoming State plan process and the impending reauthorization of the Perkins Act. In addition, the integrated review was a more efficient use of State and local time than multiple visits. ED team members benefitted through exposure to different perspectives and newly forged communication networks. The North Dakota experience provided valuable insights that will inform subsequent integrated program reviews.

THEME 3. PARTNERSHIPS AMONG FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, AND SCHOOLS THAT SUPPORT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

Partnerships among families, schools, and communities help students reach high standards by addressing the range of barriers that can impede students' academic progress. Parent involvement in education sends a loud, clear message that education is important and provides critical support for students as they learn. Powerful connections among schools, communities, and businesses can help make schools better and safer learning environments and can effect smooth transitions from preschool to school and from school to work.

● ***Parental involvement.*** People know from their own experience, as well as from research, that kids do better when their parents and the school work together on their behalf, when schools welcome parents into the building, and when parents value learning in the home. *(See Box--How Parents Can Support Children in School.)* Many programs and provisions of the ESEA enlist parents' support in helping their children learn. For parents who need additional education themselves to become stronger partners in their children's learning, the ESEA includes opportunities for family literacy programs, in which parents and children work together to improve student achievement.

- Title I, Part A emphasizes the importance of involving parents in their children's education. Title I schools must inform parents about the National Education Goals and State content and performance standards, and must explain how Title I will be linked to those standards. Interested parents must have a chance to help design and implement Title I programs at the school and district levels.

- Title I, Part A also encourages each school to provide training to help parents assist their children in meeting higher standards. Schools may use Part A funds to pay for necessary literacy training for parents if all other reasonably available funding sources have been exhausted. Furthermore, schools can use Part A funds for preschool programs for educationally disadvantaged children who reside in high-poverty areas, which could form the early childhood component of a family literacy effort.

- For the first time, Title I, Part A requires school-parent compacts for improved student achievement. Developed jointly by Title I schools and parents, these compacts spell out the goals, expectations, and shared responsibilities of both the school and the parents as partners in student success. They describe how schools will provide high-quality curriculum and instruction and how parents will support their children's learning, through such means as monitoring homework and attendance, volunteering in the classroom, participating in educational decisions, and encouraging positive use of extracurricular time.

Miami Beach, FL: Parent Power Turning Around a School

Just five years ago, Fienberg/Fisher Elementary School in Miami Beach, Florida, was "in bad shape," according to principal Grace Nebb. But this Title I schoolwide program took aggressive steps to reform its curriculum, strengthen parent participation, and reorganize resources. Fienberg/Fisher adopted the model of school-community planning and high expectations for all children advocated by social scientist James Comer and received a foundation grant to support family involvement and one-stop social services on site. The results are remarkable growth in parent involvement and impressive gains in student achievement. Between 1993-94 and 95-96, the percentage of students in grades K-6 scoring above the 50th percentile on the Stanford Achievement Test increased from 22 to 41 percent in reading and from 36 to 59 percent in math.

The efforts to improve school-parent relations began with a new parent coordinator/social worker--hired with a Danforth Foundation grant--knocking on doors, holding coffees, and doing whatever outreach seemed necessary to connect with local parents, many of whom were recent immigrants who spoke little English and shied away from school contact. The social worker trained a core group of parents to become regional "rainmakers" who make home visits, train other parents to become involved in their children's learning, and operate a referral and information network to community resources. The schoolwide program now pays for additional parent aides and another social worker.

The parent-driven referral network has branched out into a consortium that meets regularly to discuss family-related concerns and includes representatives of numerous community agencies, from the mayor's office to the housing authority to family counseling services. "These parents who hardly spoke any English are now working with the Miami Beach Development Corporation to refer families to emergency services," said Nebb. The "rainmakers" have become incorporated and are now operating a child care center on school grounds. "This consortium has become my voice and my power," she explained. "A lot of things that we've managed to get for the school--give it to a group of parents and they will get it," including two portable classrooms for Head Start, a traffic light at a busy intersection, and a fence around the school.

Parents at Fienberg/Fisher also serve on school management and school improvement teams, help out in the classroom and a family resource center, patrol the halls and walkways, and participate in Saturday and after-school programs with their children. Together these changes are producing a positive school learning environment and a better community.

- Parents who work together on behalf of all children will often be more effective than splintered groups of parents representing different programs. This is why Title I, Part

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A allows schools to use an existing parent involvement process to satisfy its requirements for parent input into planning and program design, so long as the process includes adequate representation of parents of Title I students.

- The Migrant Education program requires "appropriate consultation" with State and local parent advisory councils in planning and operating migrant programs of at least one year's duration. It also requires State and local migrant program staff to work with individual parents in ways consistent with the Title I, Part A parent involvement provisions.

- When developing ESEA-funded Indian Education programs, a school district must work with and receive written approval from a committee that is composed of at least one-half parents and that also includes teachers of Indian children and, where appropriate, secondary school students. This committee must approve any decision to use Indian Education funds in schoolwide programs.

Alamo Navajo Reservation, NM: Parents as Educational Partners

The Title I schoolwide program at the Alamo Navajo Community School in New Mexico appreciates the role that community members and parents play as children's first teachers and transmitters of traditional Navajo values. The school, which also receives ESEA Indian Education formula funding and a Title VII grant, was originally established under the Indian Self-Determination Act and is overseen by a resident school board from the Alamo Reservation. The schoolwide program has made it possible to reduce student-teacher ratios, hire additional language arts staff, and introduce a Writing to Read program, an after-school tutorial program, and a range of parent activities.

Theme-based open houses bring families to school for such diverse activities as designing rockets, making their own books, and learning country line dancing. Parents and community members volunteer in classrooms, tell traditional stories, serve on a committee that advises on all federal programs, and participate in parent and teacher partnership days, where they discuss ways to extend learning at home. The school also houses an adult GED program, an adult vocational and employment training program, and a community-based radio station.

- Parental involvement is one of the eight National Education Goals. The Goals 2000 legislation also calls on every school to promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation to promote the social, emotional, and academic growth of children. Parents, as well as other community members, must be involved in developing district and school improvement plans. Title IV of Goals 2000 provides grants to nonprofit organizations, alone or in consortia with LEAs, to implement

Parental Involvement and Resource Centers. These centers offer training *for* parents *by* parents and also dispense information through publications and toll-free telephone numbers.

- The Even Start Family Literacy program (Title I, Part B) aims to break the cycle of illiteracy through unified, multigenerational education projects aimed at helping children reach their full learning potential. Parents with limited literacy skills pursue basic literacy education, ESL education, high-school equivalency training, or parenting education, while their children ages 8 and under participate in early childhood education; young and old alike take part in family learning activities at home and at school. Even Start grantees must engage in a partnership that includes one or more LEAs and one or more nonprofit community-based organizations, public agencies, higher education institutions, or public or private nonprofit organizations. The 1994 Even Start amendments targeted services on the families most in need and extended eligibility to teen parents, one of the most needy groups.

- In planning Even Start and other family literacy activities, schools and communities can draw from--and indeed, can build upon--Title I-A, Head Start, Adult Education, and a range of other federal resources. The Head Start program, for example, provides health, education, nutrition, social, and other services to economically disadvantaged preschool children and their parents; family literacy programs often build on Head Start services. The federal Adult Education Act is often the major source of funding for the adult literacy component of a family literacy program; these funds may also be used to provide needed support services to family literacy programs, such as child care and transportation. And as noted above, Title I, Part A can support parent training and preschool education components of family literacy.

Canton, OH: Coordinating Family Literacy

Coordinating resources is the key to Canton's family literacy program, which helps parents with low literacy levels improve their academic skills and become better partners in their children's education. In the Canton (Ohio) City Schools, an initially modest Even Start grant helped unlock an impressive community chest of resources and in-kind contributions and triggered funding of other State and local grants. Families in this program walk to neighborhood schools, where Even Start coordinates services for each family member into an integrated family literacy program. Three- and four-year-olds join in school readiness activities funded by a Public Preschool State grant, while down the hall their parents participate in literacy classes supported by State adult education monies and parenting education funded by Even Start. A grant obtained by the school district's adult vocational education department provides career assessment and counseling, and a local hospital provides work-related experience to help Even Start parents become more economically self-sufficient. Vans (funded by a community initiative) transport children under age three to local preschools operated by nonprofit providers, where their care is funded by the Department of Human Services.

Canton used funds from the Barbara Bush Foundation to create a special family literacy class for young mothers and their babies. Even Start and a McKinney Homeless grant expanded family literacy services to public housing residents in a remote corner of the city. Five additional schools are integrating Even Start into schoolwide programs with Title I funding.

What are the outcomes of this uncommon degree of coordination? Nearly 90 percent of parents had met or were making significant progress toward their academic goals, according to a 1995 annual evaluation of Canton's program, including 19 percent who passed the GED during the year evaluated. Forty-three of 53 parents reported that they were more involved in helping children with school work, as a result of their own academic improvements. A majority of parents also reported talking more to their children about doing well and behaving well in school.

How Parents Can Support Children in School

Strong Families, Strong Schools provides the following suggestions for parents to support their children in school:

√ Read together.
√ Use TV wisely.
√ Establish a daily family routine.
√ Schedule daily homework times.
√ Monitor out-of-school activities.
√ Talk with children and teenagers.
√ Communicate positive values and character traits, such as respect, hard work, and responsibility.
√ Express high expectations and offer praise and encouragement.

To request a copy of this publication, contact the Department's Publications Hotline at 1-800-USA-LEARN.

■ ***Early childhood education and preschool-to-school transition.*** In keeping with the truism that prevention is less expensive and more effective than remediation, ESEA programs include expanded opportunities for early childhood education services to children of preschool age and emphasize the all-important transition from preschool to school.

- Districts and schools may use Title I, Part A funds to operate a preschool program for children who are most at risk of failing to meet State performance standards. Part A also contains new opportunities for coordinating and integrating services with Head Start, Even Start, preschool special education, and other preschool programs. The legislation encourages districts and schools to pay particular attention to the transition needs of children as they move from preschool to school.

- Ensuring that all students start school ready to learn is one of the National Education Goals codified in Goals 2000. Local Goals 2000 improvement plans must describe specific local efforts to improve school readiness for young children.

Carpentersville, IL: Continuity from Preschool to School

A Head Start/Public School Transition Demonstration project, funded through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, helped stimulate Community Unit School District #300 in Carpentersville, Illinois, to go beyond the initial project and develop a broader effort to improve learning connections between home and school and from grade to grade for district children.

Project TRANSFER, the transition demonstration, works closely with children and parents at school and in the home to improve attendance, increase achievement, and reduce family mobility. Beginning in the Head Start years and continuing through grade 3, the project involves collaboration among three school districts, a Head Start agency, and more than 65 community agencies and businesses. Children in the target prekindergarten and elementary schools (which are also Title I schools) receive developmentally appropriate instruction, and families receive home visits by family educators, parent training, and other social, health and education services. An external evaluation found that among other outcomes, participating children felt more comfortable at school than a control group, were more at ease with adults, and looked forward to working with family educators. (Achievement data for the first cohort of participants will be available in the coming months.) Family members improved their attendance at school activities as well as their parenting skills.

School District #300 has applied its experience from Project TRANSFER to create a new model of effective schooling and coordinated community services for children and families from birth through adult. Integrated funding from multiple federal and State programs is a key element. Teachers, family educators, and other key staff are paid with combined funding. Representatives from various State and federal programs--such as ESEA Title I, Drug-Free Schools, Bilingual Education, and Even Starts--meet weekly or biweekly to plan instruction and other services and activities. Prekindergarten and elementary school teachers, as well as Head Start personnel, consult regularly to enhance continuity of instruction.

■ ***Secondary school and school-to-work transitions.*** Workplace demands have changed in response to international competition and high technology, and the U.S. educational system has not kept pace. Preparing workers for the 21st century requires excellent instruction in secondary schools and better systems of transition from school to work or higher learning. Effective transition systems will provide students with high-level knowledge and skills, integration of occupational and academic learning, and a solid base for lifelong learning.

- The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 authorizes grants to States and communities, working in consultation with business and labor, to design and develop high-quality education and training programs. School-to-Work programs must span high school and college, engage students in on-the-job learning, and prepare students

for additional education and the world of work. As of August 30, 1996, 27 States had received school-to-work implementation grants, and several more were in the planning stages.

Waipahu, HI: Reshaping a School with Workforce Learning

In the Leeward Oahu district of Hawaii, a high-poverty region, secondary school educators, community colleges, and various businesses are implementing a comprehensive reform effort based on applied academics and supported with funds from the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title I, Title IV, special education, private contributions, State special needs funds, and other local funding. At Nanakuli High and Intermediate Schools, teachers are developing a curriculum to teach students in grades 7-12 core academic subjects through work-based learning. Original funding for this curricular reform came from the Perkins Act "tech-prep" program. Currently Perkins Act dollars are financing development of career "academies" for secondary students. To prepare teachers to expand this applied learning model across three high schools and their 20-plus feeder schools, the partnership is using School-to-Work Transition funds for extensive professional development and worksite internships for teachers. A solid school improvement plan is an absolute necessity for integrating funds across several programs, according to deputy superintendent Alvin Nagasako.

As a result of the 1994 amendments, Title I, Part A is channelling more resources into high-poverty middle schools and high schools and is promoting an enriched curriculum for secondary school students that embraces challenging standards and includes mentoring, counseling, and career and college awareness and preparation.

San Diego, CA: A Title I Secondary Schoolwide Program

"Title I fits in beautifully," says principal Marie Thornton of the array of resources that facilitate instruction at Gompers Secondary School Center for Science, Mathematics and Computer Technology. Located in a low-income neighborhood of San Diego, California, Gompers is a magnet school for grades 7 through 12, a Title I schoolwide program, a participant in the National Science Foundation's Urban Systemic Initiative, a recipient of multiple foundation grants--and a school that students want to attend despite the lack of an athletic program. Gompers students have achieved inspiring success. In the 1996 graduating class, more than 48 percent had a grade point average of 3.0 or higher, and 94 percent of the class went on to two- or four-year colleges and universities.

Title I schoolwide status has made it possible for Gompers to keep class sizes under 30 where possible, bring in teaching assistants from colleges and instructional assistants from the community, provide staff development, and strengthen parental involvement activities. In addition, the school provides an extended learning opportunity for incoming seventh graders--a six-week summer camp where students can develop skills in critical thinking, study habits, reading, writing, math, computer science, and scientific inquiry. During the regular school year, seventh graders, or Wildcat Cubs as they are called, participate in an integrated instructional program in science, math, English, computers, and social studies, taught by a team of eight teachers.

■ ***Linking schools and communities.*** Growing numbers of children are affected by negative influences outside the classroom--poverty, poor health, crime and violence, substance abuse, and inadequate child care, for instance--which can put them at greater risk of school failure. Recognizing that access to basic social, health, and nutritional services can help make students ready to learn, the revised ESEA strengthens the links between school and community and supports coordinated community services for students and families. ESEA programs also engage community partners in creating safe and drug-free schools that value achievement and are conducive to teaching and learning.

- The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (ESEA Title IV) supports comprehensive drug and violence prevention programs. To encourage community-wide strategies, LEAs must develop prevention plans in cooperation with local government, businesses, parents, medical and law enforcement professionals, and community-based organizations.

- The Migrant Education program (ESEA Title I, Part C) requires grantees to coordinate with other local service providers to maximize the range of educational and social services available to migrant children and their families. For example, migrant education projects often provide referrals to local food banks and clothing banks, and solicit pro bono services from local medical and dental professionals.

Kentucky: Safe and Drug-Free Schools As a Component of Comprehensive Reform

With technical assistance and professional development opportunities provided by the State, Kentucky schools are deploying funds from Titles IV, I, VI, and Goals 2000 to make low-income schools safer. As with all other components of the State system, this effort is being planned and implemented by local stakeholders in accordance with the broader ambitions of the Kentucky Education Reform Act. Kentucky school districts may apply for multiple federal program funds through a single district transformation plan; schools, for their part, develop school transformation plans.

Some Kentucky schools with drug and violence problems are using ESEA funding to implement a professional development strategy called Project Bravo, whereby teachers, counselors, principals, and other school staff learn how to integrate conflict resolution and abuse prevention activities into math, social studies, and other academic areas. Other schools are extending their hours to allow extra instructional time for students with the greatest educational needs, who often are most susceptible to substance abuse and violence problems. To support prevention efforts, the Kentucky Department of Education is using Title IV and State dollars for training in Project Bravo, other kinds of professional development, school-community team planning, parent training, and other effective ways to improve school climate.

- Communities and schools can use up to 5 percent of their ESEA funds to support coordinated services projects under Title XI. These projects aim to improve access of children and families to social, health, and education services by locating many vital services together in one place--often a school building. Communitywide partnerships of public and private agencies are essential to help families participate more fully in their children's education.

- To better serve the needs of students in high-poverty schools, Title I encourages coordination, where feasible, with health and social service programs.

THEME 4. FLEXIBILITY TO STIMULATE LOCAL SCHOOL-BASED AND DISTRICT INITIATIVE, COUPLED WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT PERFORMANCE

The school improvement needs of one community or State may differ significantly from those of another, and a one-size-fits-all approach to education reform will not work. In fact, consensus is growing that the local school is often best positioned to determine the most appropriate approaches for helping individual children. Although all local schools should set challenging academic standards for all students, there may be numerous, and equally effective, paths they can take toward attaining these goals. Under ESEA, districts and schools are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

accountable for reaching challenging goals, but they have the flexibility to determine how to get there.

● ***Areas of flexibility.*** The revised ESEA offers States and communities greater flexibility than ever before, through such options as waiver provisions, expanded opportunities for schoolwide approaches, charter schools, and increased school-level decisionmaking. Flexibility is important not so much for its own sake, but because it can give schools and communities the freedom to design the most effective possible programs to promote high student achievement.

- Provisions in Goals 2000, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and the ESEA afford the Secretary of Education broad authority to waive, at the request of States or LEAs, certain ESEA statutory and regulatory requirements that impede State and community efforts to improve teaching and learning for all students. To be approved, waivers must further the purposes of the law and increase the quality of instruction or improve the academic performance of students. Certain key requirements, such as civil rights, comparability, supplement-not-supplant, distribution of funds to State and local recipients, participation of private school children, and parent involvement, may not be waived. *(See Box--New Waiver Opportunities in Federal Education Programs.)*

- Up to 12 States may participate in the Education Flexibility (Ed-Flex) demonstration program established by Goals 2000. Without Ed-Flex, States and school districts apply directly to the U.S. Secretary for a waiver; States participating in Ed-Flex can make these waiver decisions at the State level. The U.S. Secretary of Education delegates to Ed-Flex States the authority to waive certain federal education statutory and regulatory requirements affecting the State and its local districts and schools. To be eligible to participate, a State must have an approved comprehensive school improvement plan; it must also allow for waivers of its own State requirements, while holding districts and schools affected by waivers accountable for student academic performance. As of September 5, 1996, nine States had been granted Ed-Flex authority: Oregon, Massachusetts, Kansas, Vermont, Ohio, Texas, Maryland, Colorado, and New Mexico.

New Waiver Opportunities in Federal Education Programs

As of September 5, 1996, the U.S. Department of Education had approved 129 waivers. After consultation with Department staff, another 108 waiver applicants learned that they could implement their plans for school improvement without a waiver. In one sense, then, waivers have served as an important avenue for the Department to provide technical assistance to educators. Requests for waivers also help keep the Department abreast of the local impact of federal requirements and help guide State and local implementation decisions.

The majority of waivers granted have been for ESEA Title I requirements. Provisions of other programs that have been waived relate to the proportion of ESEA Title II funds devoted to professional development in mathematics and science and other core subjects, the formation of consortia under the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, and the consolidation of administrative funds under ESEA Title XIV. The following are examples of waivers granted:

- Kentucky, which already has a performance-based student assessment and accountability system to match its challenging State content and performance standards, was granted a waiver of certain ESEA Title I provisions in order to align Title I accountability requirements with comparable components of the State system. The State accountability system is based on biennial periods of review, in which two years' data are averaged, while Title I accountability is based on annual reviews for two consecutive years. The waiver supports the purposes of Title I by promoting high academic expectations for all children and by focusing on accountability and improvement.

- The Fort Worth Independent School District in Texas received a waiver that allows it to target extra Title I dollars to four very high-poverty, inner-city elementary schools identified for top-to-bottom reforms based on low achievement on State assessments and other factors. Although other schools in the district ranked higher in terms of poverty, these schools demonstrated a higher degree of educational need among their students than the schools with greater poverty. The targeted schools are attempting to increase academic achievement by reorganizing staff, lengthening the school year, intensifying instruction in reading and math, providing extensive teacher training, and strengthening the schools' links to their communities.

- Based on needs identified by member districts, the Riverview Intermediate Unit 6 Title II Consortium in Shippenville, Pennsylvania, received a waiver that permits it to use up to 50 percent of its Eisenhower Professional Development funds to provide teacher training in core subject areas other than math and

science, while local funds and Goals 2000 continue to support professional development activities in math and science.

The Department provides information about waivers and how to apply for them through its Waiver Guidance: Goals 2000, Educate America Act, ESEA, School-to-Work Opportunities Act *(see Appendix C)*, through the Waiver Assistance Line, 202-401-7801 or 1-800-USA-LEARN; and on the World Wide Web at http://www.ed.gov/flexibility. The Department has also published several notices regarding waivers in the *Federal Registers* of August 25, 1995, Vol. 60 FR 44390-91; March 22, 1996, Vol. 61 FR 11816-19; and August 13, 1996, Vol. 61 FR 42134-35.

- As noted in Part I, 49 States have submitted an ESEA consolidated plans to the U.S. Department of Education.

- As also noted in Part I, ESEA permits States and LEAs to consolidate their ESEA administrative funds and administer all ESEA programs in a coordinated fashion, without keeping detailed program-by-program records. These provisions contribute to flexibility in program administration and assignment of personnel.

Oregon Department of Education: Coordinating Program Administration

The Oregon Department of Education is trying to put into practice the philosophy of coordination embraced in its ESEA consolidated application by structuring joint planning and professional development activities among program administrators and educators from a variety of federal and State programs. These joint activities enable program directors to exchange ideas about how to improve school performance and raise student achievement across the board. For example, State staff, including those who administer Title I, special education, migrant education, Title VI, and other programs, have jointly designed two new "certificates of mastery," credentials that augment the high school diploma by demonstrating the types of skills and knowledge that students have mastered at various points of their secondary education. In addition, State staff from various program offices have jointly developed a model district improvement plan for Goals 2000, and they regularly participate in mutual professional development. A 1996 summer institute brought together State and local directors of diverse federal programs, other educators, and parents for sessions in "cross-program sharing," consolidated district improvement planning, measurement of adequate yearly progress, effective instructional strategies, schoolwide programs, and more.

These bridge-building activities are starting to pay off, said Manuel Flores, Oregon's assistant superintendent. For example, some local districts have "braided together" funding from Title I, Part A, Title I migrant education, and the McKinney Homeless program, or have jointly funded staff positions using district funds. Title I, emergency immigrant, and bilingual education monies. "People who didn't used to know who was responsible for Eisenhower or migrant education are now coming together to integrate programs," Flores noted. Since this coordination process started two years ago, the State has seen improvements in student test scores in some low-income areas.

- As explained in Part I and elsewhere in this document, Title I schoolwide programs bring considerable administrative flexibility and enhanced opportunities to improve teaching and learning. As already noted, schoolwide programs now may include funds from most other federal education programs without meeting all the programmatic requirements, so long as their intent and purposes are met. Schoolwides do not need to demonstrate that funds were used only for targeted children and do not have to track each program's funds separately. For example, if a school includes Title II funds for professional development activities in its schoolwide program, it does not have to meet all the statutory and regulatory requirements of Title II or account for those funds separately.

- Greater decisionmaking authority for ESEA programs has devolved to the school level, enabling schools, in consultation with their districts, to determine how to use their ESEA funds in ways that make the most sense for their students. For example,

- Each Title I school now works with its district to develop its Title I-funded programs, rather than the district determining one set of practices for all schools.

- Title I targeted assistance schools have a greater voice in selecting students for services.

- Under the Eisenhower Professional Development program, teachers and principals play a critical role in determining the kinds of training they need.

- Schools and districts with large concentrations of LEP students are eligible for bilingual "comprehensive school" and "comprehensive district" grants, which enable them to include all their teachers in staff development geared toward teaching LEP students.

- In programs for neglected and delinquent youth, institutions may pool Title I, Part D and other federal (and State) education funding to operate institution-wide education programs. Through such efforts, which may include vocational education, institutions can focus on preparing youngsters for life outside the institution.

- The Public Charter Schools program encourages teachers, parents, and others to create their own high-performance schools, schools within schools, or clusters of schools, outside the constraints of most rules and regulations. Twenty-six States now have laws authorizing charter schools. Each is allowing a limited number of schools to sweep away virtually all State rules and regulations--except requirements for civil rights, health and safety, and financial audits--in exchange for better results in student learning. Charter school developers have identified lack of access to start-up funds as the most significant obstacle to their success; the ESEA program helps to address this need by providing funds for school planning and initial implementation.

- ESEA Title VIV gives LEAs the latitude, with State approval, to use unneeded funds under any ESEA program (other than Title I, Part A) for another ESEA program.

Los Angeles, CA: A Charter for Change

The Vaughn Next Century Learning Center in Los Angeles converted to a public charter school in 1993 and is demonstrating how reduced red tape, strong leadership, and hard work can transform a school of more than 1,110 students. All Vaughn students come from low-income families, and 87 percent have native languages other than English. At the start of this decade, Vaughn's achievement test scores lagged far behind the rest of the State, and faculty morale was low. The shift to charter status and arrival of a new principal stimulated a host of major reforms, including a 200-day school year, small class sizes, integrated technology, accelerated English transition programs, comprehensive on-site health and social services, and a family center. Today standardized reading and math test scores have gone up, in some cases remarkably, in nearly all grades. For example, the median percentile score on the grade 4 standardized reading test rose from the 19th percentile in 1994-95 to the 37th in 1995-96 among English-speaking students who took the CTBS, and from the 46th percentile to the 53rd among Spanish-speaking students who took the Aprenda test.

The regulatory freedom associated with being a charter school—"the engine of all reforms," as principal Yvonne Chen once observed—allowed the school to contract out payroll, food service, insurance, and other services, use personnel more flexibly without collective bargaining (and still pay teachers above union salary scale), and make numerous cost savings and improvements in efficiency. Title I and Title VII funds are part of the mix. Title I has enabled the school to offer an after-school program and to hire parent aides, while providing them with training and a career ladder.

- *Accountability for results.* The redesigned ESEA couples greater flexibility in decisionmaking with greater accountability for student learning. The existence of high standards and high-quality aligned assessments provides the framework for this results-oriented approach to accountability.

  - Under the performance-based accountability approach of Title I, Part A, each Title I school and district will be required to demonstrate, based on State assessments and other measures, adequate yearly progress toward helping students to meet State performance standards. Failure of schools or districts to make adequate progress will lead to their identification for improvement and technical assistance. Continued failure will ultimately lead to corrective actions. Rewards are also available for success.

  - States that are developing accountability systems based on high standards will use those same systems to satisfy federal accountability requirements. Rather than testing all students participating in Title I, Part A programs, as required in the past, States need only test children at certain key grade levels. This eliminates duplicative and

sometimes wasteful testing. Moreover, it ensures that Title I, Part A programs are part of, rather than operating apart from, a State's regular assessment program.

- A State must determine the effectiveness of all of its Migrant Education programs in helping migrant students meet the same standards established for all children in the State. In most cases, the State will use the same Statewide assessments used for Title I, Part A, but for some programs (e.g., a summer-only project) this may be infeasible. In these situations, the State will must evaluate the migrant program and remedy problems it identifies.

- States and communities have increased responsibility for the success of their Safe and Drug-Free Schools activities. They must assess needs and measure program outcomes, then use this information to shape programs. They also must report publicly on progress toward reducing violence and drug use in schools and communities.

Theme 5: Resources targeted to areas with greatest needs, in amounts sufficient to make a difference

A basic premise of standards-based reform is that one cannot choose between equity and excellence. Without excellence there will be no equity, since students will be denied the right to reach their potential and take advantage of opportunities, and without equitable access to quality education, no educational system can hardly be deemed excellent. ESEA contains several provisions to ensure equitable distribution of resources, equitable participation of private school students in federal programs, and equitable environments of children with special needs in education reforms.

● *Targeting resources.* Helping all children achieve to high standards entails additional funding targeted at the students most in need. Although the goal of greater targeting of resources was only partially fulfilled in the reauthorized ESEA, the law contains several important provisions to improve targeting. For example:

- Under Title I, Part A, funds are no longer allocated to the very wealthiest school districts. To be eligible, a district must have at least 10 children from low-income families and more than 2 percent poverty.

- Funds above the 1999 appropriation amount for Title I, Part A are to be allocated to local educational agencies as "targeted grants," which provide increased per-child amounts for districts with high numbers or percentages of children from low-income families. Districts must have at least 5 percent poverty to be eligible for targeted grants. To date this provision has not been activated.

- LEAs now allocate Title I, Part A funds to school buildings based on poverty, not educational need. Part A further ensures that funds flow to the most needy schools by requiring LEAs to serve all schools, including middle schools and high schools, with at least 75 percent poverty before serving lower-poverty schools of any grade span.

- The Migrant Education program now targets services to the most mobile children, who experience the most disruption in schooling. This is accomplished by limiting the population counted for funds allocation purposes to those who have moved within the last three years and by creating a priority for services to children whose education has been interrupted during the school year.

- In order to provide extra Title II Eisenhower Professional Development funds to needier schools and districts, States use the poverty-based Title I formula to distribute one-half of the Title II funds to LEAs. (The other half is distributed to LEAs based on numbers of students enrolled.)

- The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act better concentrates resources on places hardest hit by violence and drugs. Half the funds allocated by formula to States and school districts are allocated on the basis of their Title I funding distribution. States also designate a limited number of high-need districts to receive 30 percent of local grant funds.

- Goals 2000 requires States to allocate at least half of their LEA grants to school districts with special needs, as indicated by high numbers or percentages of low-income children, low student achievement, or similar criteria.

■ ***Participation of private school children.*** Since the inception of the ESEA, private school children have been included in Title I and other programs. The 1994 amendments continue to require States and school districts to provide for equitable participation of private school children.

- The general provisions of ESEA Title XIV, as well as specific provisions of Title I and Title VI, vest States and school districts with responsibilities for ensuring participation of private school children in federal programs on an equitable basis. SEAs and LEAs must develop ESEA services in meaningful and timely consultation with private school officials. In cases where an SEA or LEA is prohibited by law from serving private school children, or has failed to do so, the Secretary of Education bypasses the agency and directly arranges services for private school children.

- Public agencies retain control of funds used to serve private school children. Services are delivered by public agency employees or through contracts between a public agency and an individual, agency, or organization. Educational services for both public and private school children must be secular, neutral, and nonideological. *(For*

more details about private school participation issues for Title I, Part A, see the Title I Policy Guidance--Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, in particular the guidance on Providing Services to Eligible Private School Children.)

- ***Promoting equity.*** Ensuring equity in teaching and learning for the children with the greatest educational needs is a primary goal of the ESEA. As the preceding sections illustrate, many federal programs--first and foremost Title I--focus on helping children with special needs participate in enriching educational programs and meet challenging standards. Other provisions of the ESEA also aim to promote equity in education.

  - The Magnet Schools Assistance program furthers school desegregation by promoting development of new magnet schools and programs, which attract a diverse student body with a special curriculum. Revisions to this program encourage greater interaction between students participating in the magnet program and other students in the same school and advocate projects that serve a wider range of students than are currently participating.

  - The IASA created a new section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), which requires State or local applicants for federal grants to describe the steps they will take to ensure that students, teachers, and other beneficiaries with special needs have equitable access to, and equal participation in, the programs or activities proposed in their applications. The aim is to overcome barriers to participation stemming from such factors as gender, race, color, national origin, disability, or age.

  - ESEA fiscal and accountability provisions continue to ensure that federal programs reach the children with the greatest needs and provide participants with educational services beyond what they would otherwise receive. Some of the most important accountability provisions require that federal funds be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds from State and local sources, that States and school districts maintain their own levels of fiscal effort, and that LEAs provide comparable State-funded and locally funded services in schools receiving Title I funds. The Department has prepared an ESEA Compliance Supplement that contains guidance for audits of SEAs or LEAs. This document reviews the key provisions of ESEA for auditing purposes and describes the enhanced flexibility in the revised ESEA. *(See Appendix B--Guidance Documents Issued by the U.S. Department of Education for ESEA, Goals 2000, and Related Programs.)*

CONCLUSION

Using ESEA resources in an integrated way to promote school reform and higher student achievement entails a different way of thinking about federal funding, one that may go against the grain of long-held perceptions, administrative and accounting practices, and past federal policies. In this companion document and in other ESEA guidance, the U.S. Department of Education is signaling that we have entered a new age for federal education programs. Three decades of experience with federal programs and nearly two decades of active State education reforms have resulted in new understandings and changes in philosophy. These in turn have wrought changes in legislation.

As some of the examples in this document illustrate, the necessity for improvement is often the mother of invention. Some of the most forward-thinking strategies mentioned above grew out of a negative wakeup call, in the form of poor test scores or a threat of State intervention. Similarly, a positive nudge, such as a new authority to consolidate plans or the expanded schoolwide program option, can generate a whole new mindset.

Appreciating the difficulty of comprehensive reform, the Department stands ready to assist States and school districts with technical assistance, guidance on what is permitted under law, publications, and other resources. But ultimately the effectiveness of ESEA programs will depend on sustained commitment at the State, district, and school level. The process is sometimes frustrating, and the road to reform is often long, but the rewards for our children are inestimable.

APPENDIX A

COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

REGION I: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont

Dr. Vivian Guilfoy, Director
Education Development Center Inc.
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02158-1060
Telephone: (617) 969-7100 ext.2310
Fax: (617) 332-4318
E-mail: viviang@edc.org

REGION II: New York State

Dr. LaMar P. Miller, Executive Director
New York Technical Assistance Center
New York University
32 Washington Place
New York, New York 10003
Telephone: (212) 998-5110
Fax: (212) 995-4199/4041
E-mail: millrla@is2nyu.edu

REGION III: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania

Dr. Charlene Rivera, Director
George Washington University
1730 North Lynn Street, Suite 401
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Telephone: (703) 528-3588
Fax: (703) 528-5973
E-mail: crivera@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu

REGION IV: Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia

Dr. Pamela Buckley, Director
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
Telephone: (304) 347-0441
Fax: (304) 347-0489
E-mail: buckleyp@ael.org

REGION V: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Lousiana, and Mississippi

Dr. Hai Tran, Director
Southeast Comprehensive Assistance Center
3330 North Causeway Boulevard, Suite 430
Metairie, Louisiana 70002-3573 Fax: (504) 831-5242
Telephone: (504) 838-6861 E-mail: htran@sedl.org

REGION VI: Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin

Dr. Minerva Coyne, Director
University of Wisconsin
1025 West Johnson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706 Fax: (608) 263-3733
Telephone: (608) 263-4326 E-mail: mcoyne@macc.wisc.edu

REGION VII: Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma

Dr. John E. Steffens, Director
University of Oklahoma
555 Constitution Street, Suite 128
Norman, Oklahoma 73037-0005 Fax: (405) 325-1824
Telephone: (405) 325-1711 E-mail: steffens@uoknor.edu

REGION VIII: Texas

Dr. Maria Robledo Montecel, Executive Director
Dr. Albert Cortez, Site Director
Intercultural Development Research Association
5835 Callaghan Road, Suite 350
San Antonio, Texas 78228-1190 Fax: (210) 684-5389
Telephone: (210) 684-8180 E-mail: cmontecl@txdirect.net
acortez@txdirect.net

REGION IX: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Neveda, and Utah

Dr. Paul E. Martinez, Director
New Mexico Highlands University
121 Tijeras, NE, Suite 2100
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102 Fax: (505) 242-7558
Telephone: (505) 242-7447 E-Mail: martinez@cesdp.nmhu.edu

REGION X: Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming

Dr. Ethel Simon-McWilliams, Executive Director
Mr. Carlos Sundermann, Director
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 Southwest Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 275-9479
Fax: (503) 275-9625
E-mail: simone@nwrel.org
sundermc@nwrel.org

REGION XI: Northern California

Dr. Beverly Farr, Director
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research
730 Harrison Street
San Francisco, California 94107
Telephone: (415) 565-3009
Fax: (415) 565-3012 or 2024
E-mail: bfarr@wested.org

REGION XII: Southern California (Counties: Imperial, Inyo, Los Angeles, Mono, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and San Diego)

Dr. Henry Mothner, Director
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, California 90242-2890
Telephone: (310) 922-6343
Fax: (310) 940-1798
E-mail: mothner_henry@lacoe.edu

REGION XIII: Alaska

Dr. Bill Buell, Director
South East Regional Resource Center
210 Ferry Way, Suite 200
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Telephone: (907) 586-6806
Fax: (907) 463-3811
E-mail: akrac@ptialaska.net

REGION XIV: Florida, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands

Dr. Trudy Hensley, Director
Educational Testing Service
1979 Lake Side Parkway, Suite 400
Tucker, Georgia 30084
Telephone: (770) 723-7443
Fax: (770) 723-7436
E-mail: thensley@ets.org

REGION XV: American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Hawaii, Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau

Dr. Hilda Heine, Project Director
Pacific Region Educational Laboratory
828 Fort Street Mall, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Telephone: (808) 533-6000
Fax: (808) 533-7599
E-mail heineh@prel.hawaii.edu

APPENDIX B

GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS ISSUED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR ESEA, GOALS 2000, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Title I-A

Policy Guidance for Title I, Part A--Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

Title I-B

Preliminary Guidance for the Even Start Family Literacy Program

Title I-C

Preliminary Guidance for the Migrant Education Program

Title II

Guidance for Title II, Part B: Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, State and Local Programs

Title IV

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act: State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Program: Guidance for State and Local Educational Agency Programs

Title VI

Preliminary Nonregulatory Guidance for Coordinated Services Projects

MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT

Preliminary Guidance for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program

GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT

Guidance: Equity Task Force Orientation Concerning the Department's Implementation of Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

Goals 2000: Educate America Act Guidance

Guidance for Reviewers for Reviewing Comprehensive Plans Developed Under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act

MULTIPLE PROGRAMS

Waiver Guidance: Goals 2000: Educate America Act, ESEA, School-to-Work Opportunities Act

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Compliance Supplement (including Guidance for Audits of SEAs or LEAs)

Final Consolidated State Plan Guidance

APPENDIX C

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.

2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

3. All students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our nation's modern economy.

4. U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science.

5. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

6. Every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol, and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

7. The nation's teaching force will have access to resources for the continuing improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.

8. Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.